

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, WESTERN DIVISION

Charles E. Lindsey v. Pam Bondi and Denny Hopkins

Lindsey · No. 4:26-cv-00024-RK · Decided May 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri screened Charles E. Lindsey’s pro se complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The court denied in forma pauperis status based on the plaintiff’s financial affidavit, dismissed the case without prejudice as frivolous and for failure to state a claim, and denied a motion to consolidate as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Western Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Roseann A. Ketchmark
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Western Division
DECIDED	May 18, 2026
DOCKET	4:26-cv-00024-RK
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	On initial screening of a pro se complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the court ruled on the plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis and motion to consolidate.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Initial screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); dismissal is required when an in forma pauperis action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reported citation or precedential designation in the source.
PARTIES	Charles E. Lindsey v. Pam Bondi, Denny Hopkins

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

Federal civil procedure

In forma pauperis proceedings

Frivolous-claim screening

RICO and antitrust litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff satisfied the economic eligibility requirements to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. Whether the complaint was subject to dismissal as factually frivolous or for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
3. Whether plaintiff's motion to consolidate should be denied as moot after dismissal of the action.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff did not qualify to proceed in forma pauperis because his financial affidavit did not show that paying the filing fee would force him to give up the basic necessities of life.
2. The complaint was subject to dismissal as frivolous and for failure to state a claim because the alleged facts were irrational, unintelligible, and legally insufficient.
3. The motion to consolidate was denied as moot after dismissal of the action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The opportunity to proceed in forma pauperis is a privilege, not a right."

"a court may dismiss a claim as factually frivolous only if the facts alleged are clearly baseless, a category encompassing allegations that are fanciful, fantastic, and delusional"

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff's financial affidavit stated that he owned a trust fund valued at either \$230 million or \$6 trillion and had only \$200 in monthly grocery expenses. His complaint invoked various unfair-competition, antitrust, RICO, and Hobbs Act theories but alleged few facts, including unintelligible allegations involving threats to his family and governmental or institutional efforts to stop him from repairing his home.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se civil action, an application to proceed in forma pauperis, an affidavit of financial status, and a motion to consolidate this case with another action. The district court concluded that plaintiff did not meet the economic requirements for in forma pauperis status and, alternatively, that the claims were frivolous and failed to state a claim. The court denied in forma pauperis status, dismissed the case without prejudice, and denied consolidation as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Weaver v. Pung, 925 F.2d 1097, 1099 n.4 (8th Cir. 1991)
- Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992)

OPINION

Lindsey

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

WESTERN DIVISION

CHARLES E. LINDSEY,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Case No. 4:26-cv-00024-RK)

PAM BONDI, DENNY HOPKINS,)

) Defendants.))

ORDER

Before the Court are Charles E. Lindsey's pro se motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and Affidavit of Financial Status in Support, (Docs. 1, 2), and motion to consolidate, (Doc. 3). After careful consideration and review, and for the reasons explained below, the Court ORDERS that Plaintiff's pro se motion to proceed in forma pauperis is GRANTED, this case is DISMISSED pursuant to the Court's initial screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), and Plaintiff's motion to consolidate¹ is DENIED as moot. Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) authorizes the Court to allow indigent persons to commence a civil action without the prepayment of costs. However, "[t]he opportunity to proceed in forma pauperis is a privilege, not a right." Weaver v. Pung, 925 F.2d 1097, 1099 n.4 (8th Cir. 1991). When presented with a motion to proceed in forma pauperis, the Court first determines whether the plaintiff satisfies the economic eligibility requirements. Local Rule 83.7(a) provides that the standard for determining in forma pauperis status is whether the requirement to pay the costs of the lawsuit would cause the applicant to be forced to give up the basic necessities of life. If the applicant meets the economic eligibility requirements, the Court then determines whether the applicant's complaint is "frivolous or malicious; fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). To begin, it appears from his affidavit of financial status that Plaintiff does not qualify by economic status. His affidavit states that he owns a trust fund valued at either \$230 million or \$6 1 On January 5, 2026, Plaintiff filed another case in this district, Charles E. Lindsey v. Katrin Hataway, Michael Keyhole, No. 4:26-cv-00006-RK. Plaintiff moves to consolidate the cases. trillion and his only monthly expense is \$200 for groceries. Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is accordingly denied because based upon Plaintiff's affidavit of financial status, it does not appear that paying the required filing fee would cause Plaintiff to give up the basic necessities of life. See Local Rule 83.7(a). Even if Plaintiff did

satisfy the economic eligibility requirements, however, his claims are subject to dismissal as frivolous and for failure to state a claim. “[A] court may dismiss a claim as factually frivolous only if the facts alleged are clearly baseless, a category encompassing allegations that are fanciful, fantastic, and delusional,” or if the facts alleged appear “irrational” or “wholly incredible.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992) (internal citation omitted). Plaintiff lists numerous laws, including unfair competition and antitrust laws and the RICO and Hobbs Acts. (Doc. 1-2 at 6-7.) He alleges few facts and the facts he does allege are irrational or unintelligible. Plaintiff alleges unspecified threats “to kill [his] family tree” but also that “the local or federal government is using the Kansas City College of Bio science to condem [sic] local small business who owner is using ex parte Court order to stop me from repairing my home because they are not being allowed repair their property[.]” Plaintiff’s claims are frivolous under the § 1915(e)(2)(B) standard. Conclusion Accordingly, after careful consideration and for the reasons explained above, the Court ORDERS that Plaintiff’s pro se motion to proceed in forma pauperis, (Doc. 1), is DENIED, this case is DISMISSED without prejudice, and Plaintiff’s motion to consolidate, (Doc. 3), is DENIED as moot. The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order to: Charles E. Lindsey 5533 Virginia Ave. Kansas City, MO 64110 IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Roseann A. Ketchmark
ROSEANN A. KETCHMARK, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DATED: May 18, 2026